



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,776	10/22/2003	Stewart Cole	21480-US14	8367

22829 7590 09/28/2005

ROCHE MOLECULAR SYSTEMS INC
PATENT LAW DEPARTMENT
1145 ATLANTIC AVENUE
ALAMEDA, CA 94501

EXAMINER

SALIMI, ALI REZA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1648

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/691,776

Applicant(s)

COLE ET AL.

Examiner

A R. Salimi

Art Unit

1648

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

50

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 9-21 are pending.

Priority

An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must contain a specific reference to the prior application(s) in the first sentence of the specification or in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5)). The information provided contains error. Please up-date the information by inserting the patent abandoned information for application no. 10/017,449.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 9-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 is vague and indefinite, the intended metes and bounds of the HPV-33 sequence is not defined. This affects the dependent claims.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: the intended nucleotide sequence from the human papillomavirus-33 is not defined.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: the conditions which would render detection, i.e. high

Art Unit: 1648

stringency, the salt concentrations, the wash conditions, the temperature, etc.... This affects the dependent claims.

Claim 13 is vague and indefinite, the intended papillomavirus 33 is not defined, either identify the sequence by a specific sequence identification number or a figure.

Claim 14 is indefinite for recitation of "fragment" the intended fragment is not defined.

Claims 15, 17, 19-21 recite the limitation "process" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim(s). This affects the dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 9-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification is deficient in providing adequate teaching for the claimed invention. The specification lacks teaching in general for method of detecting any and all papilloma viruses, and papillomavirus type 33 (HPV-33) in particular. First, if a HPV-33's nucleic acid is utilized in a method of detecting, the only thing that can be detected in a sample would be HPV 33 only, if the sample actually is infected with HPV-33. Yet, the method is

Art Unit: 1648

utilizing HPV-33 to detect any and all human papillomavirus type. This should be reconciled. Second, the disclosure does not set forth any condition necessary for detecting any virus including HPV-33. The specification is silent with regard to the conditions in which the specific hybridization is to be conducted. It is not clear whether the low, medium, or high stringency conditions are intended. The state of the hybridization is highly subjective, for instance a condition that one artisan might consider to be highly stringent another artisan might consider to be low stringency. Hence, absent recitation of specific conditions one of ordinary skill in the art cannot reasonably decipher the criterion intended by the applicants, and absent specific teaching undue experimentation would be required to enable the claimed invention. In addition, absent teaching the specific conditions anything from a papillomavirus to herpes virus or even HIV may be hybridized. The artisan skilled in the art would be required to conduct large quantity of undue experimentations to enable the claimed invention. There are no working examples of conditions, and considering the state of the art, and unpredictability of the field undue experimentation would be required for one ordinary skilled in the art to practice the invention. Therefore, considering large quantity of experimentation needed, the unpredictability of the field, the state of the art, and breadth of the claims, it is concluded that undue experimentation would be required to enable the intended claim. Many of these factors have been summarized *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a **written description** of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it

Art Unit: 1648

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims are broadly drawn to multitude of DNA molecules of “fragments” or “comprising sequence.” In contrast, the specification only describes sequences consisting of a sequence identified in Figures 1 or 3. Applicants do not describe other molecules encompassed by the claims, and the structural features that distinguish all such nucleic acids from other nucleic acids are not provided and the method of their use. If applicants were not in possession of the sequence limitation that are now present then they were not in possession of the method of using either. In order, to practice the method of claims one should be in possession of the sequence.

Hence, Applicants have not, in fact, described the DNA molecules that encode that are within the full scope of the claims, and the specification fails to provide an adequate written description of the claimed invention.

Therefore, given the lack of written description in the specification with regard to the structural and physical characteristics of the claimed sequence “comprising”, “fragments”, it is not clear the Applicants were in possession of the genus claimed at the time this application was filed.

See *University of California v. Eli Lilly*, 19 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ 2d 1398 (Fed. Cir. 1997):

The name cDNA is not in itself a written description of that DNA; it conveys no distinguishing information concerning its identity. While the example provides a process for obtaining human insulin-

Art Unit: 1648

encoding cDNA, there is no further information in the patent pertaining to that cDNA's relevant structural or physical characteristics; in other words, it thus does not describe human insulin cDNA Accordingly, the specification does not provide a written description of the invention

and at pg 1406:

a generic statement such as "vertebrate insulin cDNA" or "mammalian insulin cDNA," without more, is not an adequate written description of the genus because it does not distinguish the genus from others, except by function. It does not specifically define any of the genes that fall within its definition. It does not define any structural features commonly possessed by members of the genus that distinguish them from others. One skilled in the art therefore cannot, as one can do with a fully described genus, visualize or recognize the identity of the members of the genus. A definition by function, as we have previously indicted, does not suffice to define the genus because it is only an indication of what the genes does, not what it is.

See *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ 2d 1016 at page 1021:

A gene is a chemical compound, albeit a complex one, and ... conception of a chemical compound requires that the inventor be able to define it so as to distinguish it from other materials Conception does not occur unless one has a mental picture of the structure of the chemical or is able to define it by its method of preparation, its physical or chemical properties, or whatever characteristics sufficiently distinguish it. It is not sufficient to define it solely by its principal biological property, e.g., encoding human erythropoietin, because an alleged conception having no more specificity than that is simply a wish to know the identity of any material with that biological property.

Subject Matter Free over Prior art

The claims are considered to be free of art. The examiner has not located any teaching with regard to papillomavirus type 33 prior to Applicants' claimed priority. The closest art identified is by Cole et al (Journal of Virology, June 1986, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 991-995) wherein the genome organization and nucleotide sequence of human papillomavirus type 33 is disclosed.

No claims are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to A. R. Salimi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0909. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 Am to 6:00 Pm.

Art Unit: 1648

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel, can be reached on (571) 272-0902. The Official fax number is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A. R. Salimi

9/23/2005

ALI R. SALIMI
PRIMARY EXAMINER